CHERAW GAZETTE.

M. MACLEAN, EDITOR & PROPRIETOR. CHERAW, S. C., TUESDAY, AUGUST 30, 1836. VOL. I. NO. 42.

G. H. TAYLOR, PRINTER.

Published every Tuesday.

TERMS.

If paid within three months, - - - - 3. 00
If paid withinthree months after the close of the year, - - - - - - - - - 3. 50
I not paid within that time, - - - - - 4. 00

A company of six persons taking the paper at the same Post Office, shall be entitled to it at $15, paid in advance, and a company of ten persons at $20; provided the names be forwarded together, accompanied by the money.

No paper to be discontinued but at the option of the Editor till arrearages are paid.

Advertisements inserted for 75 cents per square the first time, and 37½ for each subsequent insertion.

Persons sending in advertisements are requested to specify the number of times they are to be inserted; otherwise they will be continued till ordered out, and charged accordingly.

☞ The Postage must be paid on all communications sent by mail.

RURAL ECONOMY.

Experiments of the injury to Corn caused by gathering the Fodder.

From the Farmer and Gardener.

Several publications in the Register have stated the increase of Indian corn, matured with the blades and tops. The common usage in this country, which I have followed is, to gather the blades as soon as they begin to spot, and to cut the tops immediately upon securing the blades. About the first of September last, I stript the blades from several rows in one of my corn fields, leaving a row alternately undisturbed; and cut the tops about the 7th of the month, in like manner. As I designed to make a fair and satisfactory experiment, suffered both blades and tops to be much withered before I took them from the stalks. The last of November I gathered the corn from the stripped and unstripped rows, when it was dry, and in good condition, and put it away in my barn in separate parcels. in the shucks, from both of which I husked out, the 6th of the present month, one hundred ears, without particular selection, and now subjoin their weight and measurement. I am sensible that this experiment will not precisely correspond with others which may be made. The result of such experiments will be influenced by the quality of the soil, the goodness of the crop, the manner of planting, and the maturity of the corn at the time the blades and tops are gathered. My experiment was made from a field planted four feet each way, which had an early, vigorous growth, unchecked by insects or drought and which produced more than forty-five bushels to the acre. I made other different trials upon the parcels I have mentioned, both by weight and measurement, which I think unnecessary to state, as they all tended to the same result; but perhaps, I ought not omit to mention, that the weight of the cobs of the unstript corn was double the weight of the stript, as it proves that substracting the blades and tops dries up that part of the plant which immediately supplies aliment to the grain. To this cause I also attribute the perfection of the grain to the end of the cob of the unstripped corn, whilst that on the stripped had, for the most part, withered or perished.

100 ears of Indian corn matured with blades and tops—weight on cob,	54lbs
do. shelled, - - -	54
do. measurement, 26 quarts, 1 pint,	
100 ears of Indian corn stripped of blades and tops—weight on cob,	50
do. shelled, - - -	41
do. measurement, 21 quarts.	

I have long desired to abandon gathering fodder; but it is hard to depart from common usage, especially, if the deviation has the appearance of negligence. The month of September is usually devoted by farmers to this work; the dews are then heavy, and highly injurious to labourers; it is the season for intermittent fevers, which I believe are often contracted in this employment. The month of September might be most usefully devoted to drawing out marl and other manures, and preparing fallows for wheat. When the wheat is sown and the corn gathered at full maturity, the corn stalks with the blades and tops. afford some provender and excellent litter for cattle. Few farmers have such floating capital, as justify them in entering upon the schemes of improvement without calculating the cost and probable result. The provender afforded by Indian corn cannot be abandoned, unless an equivalent be supplied. A farm divided into four or five fields, of forty acres each, and one of them annually in Indian corn, will not produce fodder, even if the land be in an approved state, beyond five hundred pounds to the acre—equal to ten tons. Four acres set in orchard grass and clover, will, if marled and manured, in two cuttings yield ten tons of hay. A gentleman in an adjoining county, in whom I have entire confidence, assured me that from one acre, very highly improved, he gathered six tons in one year. I estimate the enclosing, marling, manuring, and settling to grass four acres, at one hundred dollars per acre, and the land thus diverted from the usual purposes of agriculture, at twenty-five dollars per acre, amounting in the whole to five hundred dollars. The capital thus invested, is not sunk, but is safe and sound, and the interest upon this sum, together with the cost of cutting and securing the hay, which I estimate at forty-five dollars, is the price to be paid annually for hay, in lieu of blades and tops. A field of forty acres of Indian corn which now yields, under the old system of gathering, forty bushels to the acre—equal to one thousand bushels, if my experiment, or that of others, be not entirely fallacious, will produce an additional fifth, amounting to one thousand nine hundred and thirty-three and a third bushels; thereby producing a gain of three hundred and thirty-trree and a third bushels—equal, at fifty cents a bushel to one hundred and sixty six dollars and two thirds upon the parcels I have mentioned, the labour saved, and the grazing after the hay is secured, which is worth something. If a lot be once well set in orchard grass and occasionally dressed with manure from the stable, where the grass is fed it will remain in a state of undiminished production for many years—in this I feel confidence, from my own observation.

I have but one pit of blue marl in which I have found "gunpowder marl." It exhibits no lime by the test of acids. There is no green sand—but it has many shining particles, and a sulphureous smell. It retains the impression of large shells, and some sharks' teeth, in a state of perfect soundness, have been found. I have supposed that the hardness of the teeth has resisted the agents which decomposed the shells. On this subject, Mr. Newton's essay in the Register is highly instructive. I have long thought that this pit contained properties, fertilizing beyond lime. It does not by the test of acids exhibit lime equal to another pit; yet it has been uniformly quicker in its action, and greater in its product. I am pleased that specimens of the gunpowder marl found in Virginia, have been sent to Professor Rogers. Agriculture stands indebted to him for much useful information. I left a specimen, taken from my pit, with our Professor Ducatel. If the properties, suggested by Mr. Newton, shall be found in them, in addition to my own personal benefit, I shall feel gratified that this source of improvement is common to Virginia and Maryland.

As this article contains little more than a statement of facts, I have subjoined my name in attestation of their accuracy.

WILLIAM CARMICHAEL.

Wye, Queen Anne Co. Md., Jan. 27, 1836.

THE VISIT TO GRANDMOTHER'S.

"*It is almost sunset,*" said Helen Howland, as she turned from the window where she had been watching the beautiful clouds that lingered in the western sky. "Now Maria, let us go and ask papa what we may do to-morrow—something, he said, for it is dear mamma's birthday." Maria approached the window. The shadows of the trees were lengthening, and twilight was fast coming on. The soft wind just stirred the leaves, and scattered the light blossoms of spring along the green grass that spread itself beneath the window.

"Now sister, the sun *has* gone, and father said he would tell us when it was sunset," said little Helen; taking her sister's hand she went in search of Mr. Howland. As they opened the door of his study they heard the voice of their older brother, reading aloud. They quietly entered and waited for him to finish the chapter he had just commenced. In clear full tones he proceeded. *In the day when the keepers of the house shall tremble, and the strong men shall bow themselves, and the grinders cease because they are few, and those that look out of the window be darkened.*"

"Father," said Edward, placing his finger upon the place where he left off reading, and fixing his eyes with inquiring earnestness upon his father's face—"Father, I never can understand that verse, nor the rest of the chapter. It says, "*The grasshopper shall become a burden, and desire shall fail.*"

"Well, my son, finish reading the chapter now, and one of these days I'll explain it to you. We are yet to make arrangements for to-morrow, and George and Helen are getting inpatient."

"Well, father," said George, "when you tell brother Edward about the grasshopper, I want to hear, for they are such little things, I don't see how they they can be a burden to any body."

It is needless to describe the happiness of the children as they listened to the arrangements for the celebration of their mother's birth-day. The plan was to start early in the morning for P——, and remain a week with their aged grandmother. Nothing could have made them happier. Gladness was in their hearts and their faces beamed with joy. The sweet, silver moon had faded away, and the bright stars were glowing in the heavens long before they could close their eyes to sleep. Thus is it that in the happy hours of childhood every thing breathes of life and pleasure.

The week quickly passed. The children had enjoyed their visit to grandmother more than they had anticipated. Their hearts had been a continued wellspring of happiness and the hours had passed away like a dream.

"Father, how old is grandmother?" asked George, as they were seated in the carriage, on their return home.

"Seventy-three, my son."

"Father," said Edward, "I have been thinking that the chapter I read last Sabbath evening, must mean something about old age. Can't you explain it to me *now*?"

"Oh, father," said George, "do wait till we come to that long hill, and then we can all hear."

"The chapter," said Mr. Howland," as after they reached the foot of the hill, he turned his head around and smiled upon the listening group, "The chapter is intended to describe the decays and infirmities of old age. It is beautifully done in figurative language. Solomon has been delivering a sermon. The text is, 'Vanity of Vanities, all is vanity.' He closes it with an exhortation to young people, to remember their Creator in the days of their youth, and enforces his exhortation with arguments taken from the sufferings, calamities and sorrows of old age. He says, 'Remember thy Creator' now '*now while the sun or the light, or the stars be not darkened.*' You remember what dear grandmother said when you were looking at the moon last evening."

"O yes, papa," they said. "Your young eyes see beautiful things that are dim to me."

"*darkened.*' Solomon next says, '*nor the clouds return after the rain.*' Do you not remember the heavy shower last week? You watched till it was over; because you expected to ride. At last it all cleared away pleasantly. But when the carriage was at the door, the clouds came back, and it rained again. So with old people like grandmama; as soon as they are free from pain, another comes on. They cannot expect to be free from trial and suffering so long as they live, and their sorrows and pains are like 'a continual dropping on a very rainy day.'"

"How plain you make it seem, father," said Edward.

"Yes, papa," said little Hellen, "you haven't told brother George about the grasshoper yet."

"All in due time, my daughter. Solomon next draws his illustration from the situation of a besieged city. I think, Edward, that you cannot have forgotten the interesting account of the destruction of Jerusalem. It was at the time that Titus was emperor, that the Romans determined on its conquest. They rejected all his offers of peace, entered the city, forced all the houses, destroyed all the provisions in a most horrible manner put the wretched inhabitants to a cruel death. Famine raged in the city, and was followed by a most destructive pestilence. Then indeed did the keepers of the house tremble, for they were exposed to ruin, and the strong men bowed themselves, for they were weak and powerless. The grinders—in which corn was prepared for the sustenance of the people, ceased, for the blight of heaven had come upon their whitening fields. And those that looked out of the window, felt that the hand of the destroying angel was there, and their spirits were darkened. The doors were shut in their streets. Wearisome nights were appointed to them, and when it was morning they arose at the voice of the bird. Music had long ceased among them, and the voice of gladness was no more heard in their streets. A horrid massacre closed the scene, and upwards of one million, four hundred thousand Jews perished. Do you not see the *force* of the illustration? Thus with aged people. All resources have failed them, and they are in the desolate situation of a besieged city."—*S.S. Visitor.*

JOHN RANDOLPH.

The following is from a late number of the Richmond Compiler, where it appears as a testimony of Benjamin Watkins Leigh, on the Randolph Will case:

Questioned whether Mr. Randolph was subject to deep depressions. Ans. Sometimes he was even volatile—he was cheerful in his conversation very often, indeed, generally when I was with him—but then again I have seen him much depressed. Questioned whether Mr. R. was a suspicious man. Ans. He was, but his suspicions were not generally groundless.—He occasionally overshot the mark as all such men sometimes do; but he was a very sagacious man, and had great confidence in his own sagacity. Questioned. Would he not content himself in such cases with very little evidence? Ans. Not a little, as he would state; for he had a remarkable faculty for making a strong case out of scanty materials. Questioned. Had he not a propensity to take up strong prejudices? Ans. He did take them up.—Question. Was he not subject to strong antipathies? Ans. Yes—there were some persons of whom he always expressed dislike, without regard to party. With others he was displeased and pleased again.—He was always a peculiar man, and more so late in life than before. Witness supposed no man ever saw Mr. R. and conversed with him for fifteen minutes, without thinking him an extraordinary man. Question. When did the peculiar prejudice called *Anglo-mania* first exhibit itself in Mr. R? Ans. I believe the partiality which has been so called commenced with his birth. He possessed more anecdotes about England and Englishmen, than any man I ever knew,—He was thoroughly acquainted with the genealogy of the English gentry and of English race horses. Question. Did he not carry this feeling to extremes during the war—did you ever hear him speak of the action of the Essex? Ans. He always spoke of our naval victories with exultation—and often said that England had now met her match on the ocean, as it was her own Anglo-Saxon blood she had to contend with. Do not recollect hearing him speak of the action of the Essex; but he spake with enthusiasm of the achievements of Decatur and Perry. He was fond of English history, and admired the English character. He held in high estimation the common law of England, its trial by jury, viva voce testimony and open courts of justice—in which opinions, by the way, witness agreed with him.—His anecdotes of England after visiting that country were most interesting. He drew an impartial picture of what he saw; it was not a flattering description; but gave rather a sombre view of the state of society. Witness never heard of his habit of dining late, until he returned from Russia. He hated France as much as he Admired England. He hated the French houses, and said they were not neat, which was with him a great fault. He said he had been in France and Switzerland, and up and down the Rhine. His conversation upon the objects which came under his notice in his travels, was highly amusing and graphic; and his remarks evinced the most minute attention to every thing he saw. His conversation was of a similar cuaracter after his return from Russia.—His mind often wandered at that period. Witness thought he was at times under the influence of delirium. Also thought that his mind had been in a similar state while in St. Petersburg. Questioned as to his opinion of the state of Mr. R's. mind while in England after he left Russia?—Witness can only say that, according to Mr. R's. statements, he was sick and under great depression of spirits; and witness inferred that his condition was the same in England as here. Was convinced from what Mr. R. told him, that many of the statements in the newspapers as to his conduct in Russia and in England, were fabrications, although they had some foundations in truth. He was much secluded in London, and only went out on public occasions, to satisfy his curiosty. He went to the public breakfast given on the opening of the new London Bridge, of which he gave witness a minute account, embracing personal descriptions of Earl Grey and other distinguished individual present on the occasion. In this narrative he expressed opinions which it would not be supposed John Randolph would have entertained. He compared with great acumen the impressions derived from close examination with those he had formerly entertained, of those persons—correcting his opinions by experience and observation. He was in favor of Earl Grey's policy, and was a well wisher to the cause of English reform: but he formed on that occasion a low estimate of Earl Grey's capacity. He also spoke of Mr. O'Connell, and assured witness that he was not a mere slang-whanger; but a man of great ability. On the whole, witness thought Mr. R. was at that time laboring under delirium; and he felt great anxiety when Mr. R. left Richmond lest it should end in insanity.

Colds.—A cold is usually produced by a sudden check of the sensible perspiration; we say sensible, because there is at all times a perspiration from the surface of the body, but not in a degree to be obvious to the senses. It is when the system has been unusually excited, so as to produce sensible perspiration, that any circumstance which suddenly represses this, is likely to prove a cause of chill. The manner in which the action is thrown from the external surfaces, is unknown to us; but there seems obviously to be such a transfer of action, and with it a change in its nature; that which was healthy while without, being morbid when thrown inward. The susceptibility to chill under the excitement of perspiration depends very much on the general force of the system, and the manner in which the perspiration has been induced. If by exercise carried so far as to impair the strength, the liability is very great. A long walk, causing great fatigue—speaking for a long time in a crowd, particularly under much excitement—long dancing, or even standing in a hot crowded room, will render the system very liable to cold. On the other hand, we know that the perspiration induced by a hot bath is not so likely to be suddenly arrested to the injury of the system, especially if vigorous. Most persons in good health may face the cold air after bathing, with impunity, and to many, a sudden exposure to it is a luxury.

The Russian exchanges his bath at 235 deg. for a comfortable roll in the snow; the perspiration is checked for a moment, but the activity which has been imparted to the circulation enables the system to react, and a fine glow again follows. Another circumstance which influences liability to cold is the part of the body exposed. The feet when warm, are almost always perspiring; if then a thick boot and woolen stockings be exchanged for pumps and silk hose, and the wearer commences a walk on a surface of the temperature of zero, he will, before going far, find the air cool about his legs, and perhaps notice some unusual sensation in his olfactories. A third circumstance is the kind and degree of cold to which the body is exposed when heated. A damp cold is worse than a dry; for a damp atmosphere represses the perspiration, sensible & insensible. The night air is worse than that of the day, and late at night this circumstance is renderedof more importance by the fact that then the system is much more feeble than at any previous time. A draft of air carries off the caloric much more rapidly than still cold. From all these considerations it will not be difficult to understand why late hours, thin dresses, dancing in heated rooms, then standing near open windows or waiting for coaches in entries, where the upper stratum of air is about 80 deg. while an under current rushes from the street at 10 deg. below freezing, may be causes of cold; or why the transition from the ball room to the sick chamber, however violont in character, is often effected in a brief space. So closely in this changing world are the extremes of pleasure and of suffering too often allied. So much for the causes of colds.

We find the following simple but touching story in a French paper, *Le Droit.* Such scenes are not without parallel, in busy thriving New York.

An old man, his age was eighty-two, answered to his name, and, raising himself with difficulty, was supported by his daughter before the tribunal of his judges. To the question of the presiding magistrate, his daughter replied in a trembling voice; "My father does not hear you, gentleman, permit me to answer for him."

President.—Your father is brought before us charged with begging and being homeless.

Daughter.—May heaven pardon those who have told you that. Gentlemen, from the day I was born my father never left me, and while I can work never shall be a burthen to any one. A month since, I fell sick; we were without money; my father rose early and went out. He did not return till evening, then he sat down by the bed side and burst into tears. I asked him what ailed him. He said it was a sad thing to be old. He had applied for a situation as a labourer, but his age was against him, they refused him. I shall have to beg, said he, for how can I let thee die for want of assistance.

I told him I was better, and that I would go to work the next morning. The next morning I was unable to move. My father went out without speaking to me. An hour afterwards I was informed that the guards had arrested him for asking alms. Gentlemen, if he did so it was not for himself, but for me, when I was sick, too sick to work. If you will pardon him this time, I promise you he shall never offend again. The affecting manner in which the poor girl spoke softened even the magistrates, and justice, or rather law, gave way to feeling, and the octogenarian was discharged.

Cleveland Messenger.

Extracts from an article on Slavery in the April number of the Biblical Repertory conducted by an association of Gentlemen in Princeton, N. J.

(CONTINUED FROM LAST WEEK.)

Let us, however, consider the force of the argument as stated above. It amounts to this. Christ and his apostles thought slaveholding a great crime, but they abstained from saying so for fear of the consequences. The very statement of the argument, in its naked form, is its refutation. These holy men did not refrain from condemning sin from a regard to consequences. They did not hesitate to array against the religion which they taught, the strongest passions of men. Nor did they content themselves with denouncing the general principles of evil; they condemned its special manifestations. They did not simply forbid intemperate sensual indulgence, and leave it to their hearers to decide what did or what did not come under that name. They declared that no fornicator, no adulterer, no drunkard could be admitted into the kingdom of heaven. They did not hesitate, even when a little band, a hundred and twenty souls, to place themselves in direct and irreconcilable opposition to the whole polity, civil and religious, of the Jewish state. It will hardly be maintained that slavery was, at that time, more intimately interwoven with the institutions of society, than idolatry was. It entered into the arrangements of every family; of every city and province, and of the whole Roman empire. The emperor was the Pontifex Maximus; every department of the state, civil and military, was pervaded by it. It was so united with the fabric of the government that it could not be removed without affecting a revolution in all its parts. The apostles knew this. They knew that to denounce polytheism was to array against them the whole power of the state. Their divine Master had distinctly apprized them of the result. He told them that it would set the father against the son, and the son against the father; the mother against the daughter, and the daughter against the mother, and that a man's enemies should be those of his own household. He said that he came not to bring peace but a sword, and that such would be the opposition to his followers, that whosoever killed them, would think he did God service. Yet in view of these certain consequences the apostles did denounce idolatry, not merely in principle, but by name. The result was precisely what Christ had foretold. The Romans, tolerant of every other religion, bent the whole force of their wisdom and arms to extirpate Christianity. The scenes of bloodshed which century after century followed the introduction of the gospel, did not induce the followers of Christ to keep back or modify the truth. They adhered to their declaration that idolatry was a heinuous crime. And they were right. We expect similar conduct of our missionaries. We do not expect them to refrain from denouncing the institutions of the heathen, as sinful, because they are popular, or intimately interwoven with society. The Jesuits, who adopted this plan, forfeited the confidence of Christendom, without making converts of the heathen. It is, therefore, perfectly evident that the authors of our religion were not withheld by these considerations, from declaring slavery to be unlawful. If they did abstain from this declaration, as is admitted, it must have been because they did not consider it as in itself a crime. No other solution of their conduct is consistent with their truth or fidelity.

Another answer to the argument from scripture is given by Dr. Channing and others. It is said that it proves too much; that it makes the bible sanction despotism, even the despotism of Nero. Our reply to this objection shall be very brief. We have already pointed out the fallacy of confounding slaveholding itself with the particular system of slavery prevalent at the time of Christ, and shown that the recognition of slaveholders as Christians, though irreconcilable with the assumption that slavery is a heinous crime, gives no manner of sanction to the atrocious laws and customs of that age in relation to that subject. Because the apostles admitted the masters of slaves to the communion of the church, it would be a strange interference that they would have given this testimony to the Christain character of the master who oppressed, starved, or murdered his slaves. Such a master would have been rejected as an oppresser, or murderer, however, not as a slaveholder. In like manner, the declaration that government is an ordinance of God, that magistrates are to be obeyed within the spere of their lawful authority; that resistance to them, when in the exercise of that authority, is sinful, *

* It need hardly be remarked that the command to obey magistrates, as given in Rom. xiii. 1—3, is subject to the limitation stated above. They are to be obeyed as magistrates; precisely as parents are to be obeyed as parents, husbands as husbands. The command of obedience is expressed as generally, in the last two cases, as in the first. A magistrate beyond the limits of his lawful authority (whatever that may be) has, in virtue of this text, no more claim to obedience, than a parent who, on the strength of the passage "Children obey your parents in all things," should command his son to obey him as a monarch or a pope.

* Quoted by Pres. Young, p. 45, of the Apdress, &c.

† On the manner in which slaves were acquired, compare Deut. xx. 14. xxi. 10, 11, Ex. xxii. 3. Neh. v. 4, 5. Gen. xiv. 14. xv. 3. xvii. 23. Num. xxxi. 18, 35. Deut. xxv. 44, 46.

As to the manner in which they were to be treated, see Lev. xxv. 39—53. Ex. xx. 10. xxii. 2—8. Deut. xxv. 4—3, &c. &c.

gives no sanction to the oppression of the Roman emperors, or to the petty vexations of provincial officers. The argument urged from scripture in favour of passive submission, is not so exactly parallel with the argument for slavery, as Dr. Canning supposes. They agree in some points, but they differ in others. The former is founded upon a false interpretation of Rom. xiii. 1—3; it supposes that passage to mean what it does not mean, whereas the latter is founded upon the sense which Dr. C. and other opponents of slavery, admit to be the true sense. This must be allowed to alter the case materially. Again, the argument for the lawfulness of slaveholding, is not founded on the mere injunction, "Slaves obey your masters," analogous to the command, "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers," but on the fact that the apostles did not condemn slavery; that they did not require emancipation, and that they recognised slaveholders as Christain brethren. To make Dr. Channing's argument of any force, it must be shown that Paul not only enjoined obedience to a despotic monarch, but that he recognized Nero as a Christain. When this is done, then we shall admit that our argument is fairly met, and that it is just as true that he sanctioned the conduct of Nero as that he acknowledged the lawfulness of slavery.

* * * *

The truth on this subject is so obvious that it sometimes escape unconsciously from the lips of the most strenuous abolitionists. Mr. Birney says, "He would have retained the power and authority of an emperor; yet his oppressions, his cruelties would have been suppressed; his power would have been put forth for good and not for evil."* Here every thing is conceded. The possession of despotic power is thus admitted not to be a crime, even when it extends over millions of men, and subjects their lives as well as their property and services to the will of an individual. What becomes then of the arguments and denunciations of slaveholding, which is despotism on a small scale? Would Mr. Birney continue in the deliberate practice of a crime worse than robbery, piracy, or murder? When he penned the above sentiment, he must have seen that neither by the law of God nor of reason is it necessarily sinful to sustain the relation of master over our fellow creatures; that if this unlimited authority be used for the good of those over whom it extends and for the glory of God, its possessor may be one of the best and most useful of men. It is the abuse of this power for base and selfish purposes which constitutes criminality, and not its simple possession.

* * * *

The consideration of the Old Testament economy leads us to the same conclusion on this subject. It is not denied that slavery was tolerated among the ancient people of God. Abraham had servants in his family who were "bought with his money," Gen. xvii. 13. "Abimeleck took sheep and oxen and men servants and maid servants and gave them unto Abraham." Moses, finding this institution among the Hebrews and all surrounding nations, did not abolish it. He enacted laws directing how slaves were to be treated, on what conditions they were to be liberated, under what circumstances they might and might not be sold; he recognizes the distinction between slaves and hired servants, (Deut. xv. 10); he speaks of the way by which these bondmen might be procured; as by war, by purchase, by the right of creditorship, by the sentence of a judge, by birth; but not by seizing on those who were free, an offence punished by death.† The fact that the Mosaic institutions recognized the lawfulness of slavery is a point too plain to need proof, and is almost universally admitted. Our argument from this acknowledged fact is, that if God allowed slavery to exist, if he directed how slaves might be lawfully acquired, and how they were to be treated, it is in vain to contend that slaveholding is a sin, and yet profess reverence for the scriptures. Every one must feel that if perjury, murder, or idolatry had been thus authorized, it would bring the Mosaic institutions into conflict with the enternal principles of morals, and that our faith in the divine origin of one or the other must be given up.

Dr. Channing says, of this argument also, that it proves too much. "If usages, sanctioned under the Old Testament and not forbidden under the New, are right, then our moral code will undergo a sad deterioration. Polygamy was allowed to the Israelites, was the practice of the holiest men, and was common and licensed in the age of the apostles. But the apostles no where condemn it, nor was the renunciation of it made an essential condition of admission into the Christian Church." To this we answer, that so far as polygamy and divorce were permitted under the old dispensation, they were lawful, and became so by that permission; and they ceased to be lawful when the permission was with-